



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,232	08/26/2003	Edward P. Ingenito	10991-002004	6203
23628	7590	01/09/2008	EXAMINER	
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C. 600 ATLANTIC AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02210-2206			VU, QUYNH-NHU HOANG	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3763		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		01/09/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/649,232	INGENITO, EDWARD P.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Quynh-Nhu H. Vu	3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Amendment 08/28/07 has been entered.

Claims 1-18 are present for examination.

Applicant's arguments filed on (date) have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Therefore, claims 1-18 are rejected in the same ground rejections as set forth in the office action mailed 8/28/07.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Perkins et al. (US 6,287,290).

Perkins discloses methods, systems and kits for lung volume reduction that includes advancing the bronchoscope (see 8:18+) and introducing biological material to reduce the volume of the lung (see 10: 37+). The method includes blocking air flow (9: 19+). The collapsed region may be over inflated prior to collapsing the region (9:33). An oxygen rich gas, or liquid can be introduced prior to collapse (see 2:30+, 6:59+ and 9:45). The collapsed region will be sealed by methods include the use of tissue adhesive, such as fibrin glues (2, 37+) or using a plug of hydrated collagen hydrogel (biological material for promoting fibrosis and increasing surface tension), and energy-mediated tissue adhesion, ect. (10:37-45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins in view of Edwardson et al. (US 5,739,288).

Perkins meets the claim limitations as described above but fails to disclose the use of fibrinogen and a fibrinogen activator such as thrombin.

Edwardson discloses a fibrin sealant composition that can be used for sealing tracheal and bronchial anastomoses and air leaks or lacerations of the lung (promoting fibrosis) that includes fibrinogen, thrombin, clot promoting factor XIIIa and antibiotics. Since the invention of Perkins is drawn to closing a region of the lung by gluing tissue (see Perkins 10:40) and Edwardson teaches a composition to enhance the closure of leaks or laceration of the lung (i.e. a tissue sealant) a combination is proper. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to use the fibrin sealant of Edwardson et al. in order to provide an enhanced fibrin formulation for tissue closure thereby improving patient recovery time.

Claims 2-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins in view of Edwardson, in further in view of Antanavich et al. (US 5,814,022).

Perkins in view of Edwardson meets the claim limitations as described above but fails to include the composition comprising 3-12% fibrinogen.

Antanavich discloses a method and apparatus for applying tissue sealant that includes that use of an adhesive protein solution having a fibrinogen content of from 3 to 12% with clot promoting factor XIIIa and further notes that one reason for this arrangement is that the strength of the sealant is proportional to the fibrinogen concentration. Since the invention of Perkins is drawn to closing a region of the lung by gluing tissue (see Perkins 10: 40) and Antanavich teaches an enhanced fibrin sealant composition a

combination is proper. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the concentration of fibrinogen as taught by Antanavich et al. into the invention of Perkins in order to have an adhesive protein solution that is less prone to clogging before administered to the therapeutic site as taught by Antanavich et al. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the composition of fibrinogen from 3-12%, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3, 13 and 15 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 14, 15, 22, 23, 31, 55, 60 of copending Application No. 10/069307. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because instant claims are fully disclosed and covered by the claims of the copending application claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 08/28/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Perkins reports using certain material to occlude an air passage leading into a collapsed lung region, but Perkins fails to disclose introducing an anti-surfactant into a diseased alveolar region to reduce the volume of the lung region.

Examiner disagrees about this point. Perkins discloses that air passage may be sealed or occluded with fibrin glues (col. 2, lines 33-40, col. 10, lines 37-42). In order to seal with fibrin glue, the method must be introduce the anti-surfactant (adhesive or sealant materials such as fibrin) into alveolar region (diseased region) for sealant/adhering the tissue.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh-Nhu H. Vu whose telephone number is 571-272-3228. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00 am to 3:00 pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Quynh-Nhu H. Vu
Examiner
Art Unit 3763



USPTO-SAC-1209-001